



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

4m

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

09/433,705

11/04/1999

SHUNPEI YAMAZAKI

0756-2062

2883

31780

7590

02/23/2004

ERIC ROBINSON

PMB 955

21010 SOUTHBANK ST.

POTOMAC FALLS, VA 20165

EXAMINER

LOKE, STEVEN HO YIN

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2811

DATE MAILED: 02/23/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

73

Advisory Action	Application No. 09/433,705	Applicant(s) YAMAZAKI, SHUNPEI	
	Examiner Steven Loke	Art Unit 2811	

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 14 January 2004 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avoid abandonment of this application. A proper reply to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) a timely filed amendment which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely filed Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.

PERIOD FOR REPLY [check either a) or b)]

- a) ☐ The period for reply expires _____ months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
- b) ☒ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection. ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

1. ☐ A Notice of Appeal was filed on _____. Appellant's Brief must be filed within the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal.
2. ☒ The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered because:
- (a) ☒ they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
 - (b) ☐ they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);
 - (c) ☐ they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
 - (d) ☐ they present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: See Continuation Sheet.

3. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): _____.
4. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).
5. ☒ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☒ request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: See Continuation Sheet.
6. ☐ The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.
7. ☒ For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment(s) a) ☒ will not be entered or b) ☐ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:

Claim(s) allowed: 46-50, 70 and 76.

Claim(s) objected to: _____.

Claim(s) rejected: 13-17, 51-69, 71-75 and 77-82.

Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: _____.

8. ☐ The drawing correction filed on _____ is a) ☐ approved or b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
9. ☒ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) ^{filed on} ~~Paper No(s)~~ 1/3/01 and 7/24/03.
10. ☒ Other: See Continuation Sheet

Steven Loke
Examiner

Continuation of 2. NOTE: The underline portions of claims 13-16, 46-48, 51-53, 55-57, 60-61, 64-66, 81 would require further consideration and/or search.

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: The examiner is still believed that reference numerals 316 to 319, 326, 327, 334 and 335 should point to the shaded n- type regions instead of the unshaded regions in the figures. The examiner believed that the combined device of Kurokawa and Nakazono provides the claimed structure as set forth in the claims. The silicon dioxide films [26] are used to form the regions [27] instead of regions [25]. Since Nakazono also has a highly doped region [7a], it is proper to have the silicon dioxide films [26] of Kurokawa in Nakazono. The reasons to combine Nakazono and Kurokawa is set forth in page 4 of the last office action. The combined devices of Nakazono, Kurokawa, Maddox and Hamada also provide the claimed structures as set forth in the dependent claims .

Continuation of 10. Other: The examiner does not have the full English translation of JP 8-264784 of Kurokawa.